

Summary of Written/Oral Representations

Item No.	No. of Views*		Views	EAC's views
	W	O		
<i>Suggestions to re-delineate the existing boundaries of GCs</i>				
1	10	-	Support to maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs.	The supporting views are noted.
2	2	1	<p>Propose to transfer the Islands District from NTW to HKI. The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agree with the EAC's views that the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs should be maintained as the members of the public are generally well accustomed to them. However, have reservation on the proposal to maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs on grounds of the absence of any obvious and fundamental change in the population structure ; • the population of NTW has been in an excessive level for two consecutive terms and NTW has a higher population growth among the 5 GCs in terms of area development and median age of population. The problems of overpopulation and re-delineation of NTW 	<p><u>Items (2) - (6)</u></p> <p>These proposals are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) there has not been a major shift in the territorial population ratio across the 5 GCs since the last LegCo general election and the percentage deviation of the projected population from the resulting number of the 5 individual GCs is within the 15% permissible range stipulated under section 20(1)(b) of the EACO. As for NTW, its percentage of deviation from the resulting number is similar to that of the last LegCo general election;</p> <p>(ii) gradual development of the community infrastructure and transportation network may better connect the related districts in the long run. However, these developments will not</p>

* W: Number of written representation
O: Number of oral representation

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>will be even more serious in the next delineation exercise;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • although the EAC recommends to maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs in order to avoid causing unnecessary confusion to electors, there will be even greater confusion and more people will be affected if re-delineation is to be done in the next delineation exercise; • the Islands District's connections with HKI are closer than that with other areas in NTW as Hong Kong Island is the end point of most of outbound traffic of the islands, such as the terminals of Tung Chung Line of Mass Transit Railway ("MTR") are at the Islands District and Hong Kong Island respectively; and • in view of the development in future, the population of the Islands District will continue to increase. If the Islands District remains in NTW, the residents of NTW will not be able to return an appropriate number of LegCo Members and therefore have insufficient 	<p>necessarily change the long-established community identities and local ties of the relevant areas. The existing boundaries of the 5 GCs have come into existence since 1998 and the community identities and local ties within each of the GCs have been long established. Any suggestion to re-delineate the GC boundaries will unavoidably risk upsetting the long-established community identities and local ties and will not bring about substantial improvement in the delineation exercise;</p> <p>(iii) some of the representations involve splitting of Districts which will adversely affect the long-established community identities of the areas;</p> <p>(iv) many of the representations received by the EAC during the consultation period are in support of maintaining the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs (see item (1));</p> <p>(v) there is representation</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>number of representatives.</p> <p>Apart from the proposal to transfer the Islands District from NTW to HKI, one of the representations further suggests that the EAC, after the calculation in Step One of seats allocation, to allocate the 2 remaining seats to HKI.</p>	<p>opposing the transfer of the Islands District to HKI (see item (7)); and</p> <p>(vi) regarding the suggestion concerning allocation of seats, the EAC has to allocate the seats having regard to the projected population of the proposed GCs.</p>
3	1	-	Proposes to transfer Tseung Kwan O of the Sai Kung District to KE in view of the population growth and transport development.	
4	1	-	Suggests the EAC to re-delineate the New Territories area into 3 GCs in view of its continuous population growth. Besides, proposes to merge KW and KE into 1 GC and then allocate 9 seats to the new Kowloon GC.	
5	1	-	Proposes to re-delineate the GCs in Kowloon area by re-delineating the areas in the south of Boundary Street as the Kowloon GC, or merging the areas in the south of Boundary Street with HKI to form a larger GC. After the above changes, combine the remaining areas in Kowloon with the New Territories area to form 3 or 4 GCs.	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
6	1	-	<p>Considers that in accordance with the existing legislation, the maximum number of seats to be returned for each GC is 9. After the calculation in Step One, the entitled number of seats of NTW is 9.97 which is reaching 10 seats. However, given that the number of Members to be returned for each GC is to be a number not greater than 9, only 9 seats could be allocated to NTW, making NTW have insufficient seats of representation consecutively in the past four general elections since 2004. It is therefore proposed to re-delineate the boundaries of NTW, NTE, KW and KE. The representation lists out a number of possible options. After consideration, it considers that among the options, the following proposal has the smallest range of the percentage deviations, which is between -1.99% and +1.56%. The component Districts, population and allocated seats of the proposed GCs are as follows:</p> <p>HKI (boundary remains unchanged) (Central & Western, Wan Chai, Eastern and Southern) (1 268 000) – 6 seats</p>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>KW and New Territories South (Yau Tsim Mong, Sham Shui Po, Tsuen Wan, Kwai Tsing and Islands) (1 699 500) – 8 seats</p> <p>KE (Kowloon City, Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong) (1 497 100) – 7 seats</p> <p>New Territories North (Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and North) (1 444 800) – 7 seats</p> <p>NTE (Tai Po, Sha Tin and Sai Kung) (1 461 100) – 7 seats</p> <p>The relevant factors of consideration are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> from the perspective of community ties, the Tsuen Wan District and Kwai Tsing District have been more closely connected with the Sham Shui Po District and Yau Tsim Mong District since the operation of MTR service. Moreover, both the Tsuen Wan District and Kwai Tsing District have been regarded as “metro areas” in the Government’s city planning; 	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views</i> *		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • since the EAC can hardly split the Districts in the delineation exercise, apart from delineating the Islands District and Central & Western District in the same constituency, another appropriate way is to delineate the Islands District, Tsuen Wan District and Kwai Tsing District in the same GC as these three Districts are connected by roads; • to transfer the Kowloon City District from KW to KE because the Kowloon City District is separated from the Sham Shui Po District and Yau Tsim Mong District by the railway track, which forms as obstacle in pedestrian and traffic flow between the Kowloon City District and the latter two Districts. Conversely, it is more reasonable or even better to delineate the Kowloon City District, Wong Tai Sin District and Kwun Tong District in the same GC; and • there are closer traffic ties between the North District, Yuen Long District and Tuen Mun District and these three Districts are near the 	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			border. Therefore, they have similar community background.	
7	-	1	<p>Disagrees to the suggestion of transferring the Islands District to HKI for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the majority of the population of the Islands District resides in Tung Chung, which is connected to other districts by land; and • the population of Hong Kong Island will continue to decrease in the years to come. If the Islands District is transferred to HKI, the sea connection is incompatible with the future development. The link among district councils will also be lost. 	The view is noted. Under the EAC's provisional recommendations, the Islands District will be retained in NTW.
Numbers of GCs				
8	1	-	Proposes to add 1 GC to the New Territories area by re-delineating the 2 existing GCs into 3 GCs, namely NTW, NTE and New Territories North in view of the large area covered by NTW and NTE and that there will be a continuous increase in population in the area. The population and allocated seats of the proposed	<p><u>Items (8) - (11)</u></p> <p>These proposals involve amendment to LCO which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred these views to the CMAB for reference.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>GCs are as follows:</p> <p>HKI (boundary remains unchanged) (Central & Western, Wan Chai, Eastern and Southern) (1 268 000) – 6 seats</p> <p>KW (boundary remains unchanged) (Yau Tsim Mong, Sham Shui Po and Kowloon City) (1 141 900) – 6 seats</p> <p>KE (boundary remains unchanged) (Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong) (1 084 600) – 5 seats</p> <p>NTW (Tsuen Wan, Tuen Mun, Kwai Tsing and Islands) (1 471 000) – 6 seats</p> <p>NTE (Tai Po, Sha Tin and Sai Kung) (1 461 100) – 7 seats</p> <p>New Territories North (Yuen Long and North) (943 900) – 5 seats</p>	
9	1	1	Proposes to combine the existing 5 GCs into 1 GC.	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
10	-	1	Considers that the whole territory should be delineated into 6 instead of 5 GCs.	
11	1	-	Objects to the splitting of GCs.	
Number of seats				
12	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes to increase the number of GC seats to 40 with the following distribution:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">HKI - 8 seats KW - 7 seats KE - 7 seats NTW - 9 seats NTE - 9 seats</p> <p>(b) Proposes to increase the number of seats in Functional Constituencies to 40.</p>	<p><u>Items (12) - (14)</u></p> <p>The proposal to increase the total number of seats in GCs and Functional Constituencies involves amendment to Annex II to the Basic Law and LCO. Other proposals also involve amendment to LCO, which falls outside the EAC's purview. The EAC has referred these views to the CMAB for reference.</p>
13	1	-	Opposes to the allocation of seats among the GCs in the EAC's provisional recommendations and considers that the EAC should put forward to the Government proposal to amend the existing provision which stipulates that the number of Members to be returned for each GC should not be greater than 9.	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
14	-	4	<p>Propose that NTW should be allocated with 10 seats. The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the entitled number of seats of NTW reaches 9.97 after the calculation in Step One. If the population of each GC should be as near as practicable to the resulting number, 10 seats should be allocated to NTW; • the percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number of GCs can be minimised if the upper limit of the number of seats for each GC is increased to 10. Owing to the existing statutory limit, the residents of NTW were short of one Member to provide service for them for eight consecutive years. The EAC should request the Administration to amend the relevant provision; • although the percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number of individual GC is not more than the statutory permissible range of 15% under the EAC's provisional recommendations, there is a large difference between the percentages of deviation from the resulting number of 	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>NTW (+10.82%) and KW (-9.63%). The percentage of deviation of NTW can be improved if 10 seats can be allocated to it; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • due to the statutory limit, only 9 seats can be allocated to NTW. This does not comply with the principles of equal right and universal suffrage. 	
15	2	2	<p>Consider that the number of seats allocated to each GC should remain unchanged. The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an increase or decrease in the number of seats allocated to a GC will have a significant implication on the GC. Under the provisional recommendations, HKI will be reduced by 1 seat as compared with the delineation exercise in 2012 while KW will be allocated one more seat. Even if HKI is to retain the existing 7 seats, its percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number will still fall within the statutory permissible range. Therefore, it is not necessary for HKI to be reduced by 1 seat; and 	<p>The proposals are not accepted because seats are allocated having regard to the projected population of the proposed GCs. The EAC's provisional recommendations has adopted the option which gives the smallest range of the percentage deviations of the population from the resulting number in the individual GCs with a view to ensuring that the population in each proposed GC is as near as practicable to the resulting number as required under section 20(1)(a) of the EACO.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> given that the number of Members to be returned for all GCs in the 2016 LegCo General Election remains unchanged, the number of seats allocated to each GC should also be maintained. 	
16	-	1	Proposes that the number of seats allocated to each GC should be the same.	<p>The proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) given that the population is unevenly distributed among the existing 5 GCs, substantial changes on the boundaries of the existing GCs will be required if on one hand, the 35 seats have to be distributed evenly among the GCs and on the other hand, the existing statutory criteria concerning the percentage of deviation from the resulting number of GC is to be complied with. The changes will cause unnecessary confusion to electors in the coming election;</p> <p>(ii) the existing legislation does not require that the seats should be equally allocated; and</p> <p>(iii) please see item (15).</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
Percentage of deviation from the resulting number				
17	-	1	Proposes to amend the upper and lower limits of the percentage deviation of a GC's population from the resulting number (i.e. +/-15%) to a smaller range. The current upper and lower limits were enacted in 1998 when there were only 20 seats to be returned for 5 GCs. As the number of seats has been increased to 35, the statutory upper and lower limits of the percentage of deviation should be reduced.	This proposal involves amendment to EACO which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the CMAB for reference.
Others				
18	-	1	Considers that although the allocation of seats to each GC is calculated by the population quota (i.e. 210 586), there is a difference of over 300 000 population between some GCs making the size of population that a LegCo seat served varies largely between GCs. For example, a candidate of KE has to obtain 20% of the valid votes so as to secure a seat while candidates of other GCs will only need to obtain about 8-10% of the valid votes. This will possibly cause unfairness in the election.	<u>Items (18) and (19)</u> The EAC has adhered to the statutory requirements stipulated in the LCO, the statutory criteria of the EACO and the EAC's established working principles in drawing up the proposals in the delineation exercise. The existing practice ensures that the population in each GC is as near as practicable to the resulting number making the number of persons represented by a LegCo seat nearly the same.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
19	1	-	Considers that the EAC should ensure that the population in each proposed GC is as near as practicable to the resulting number.	
20	1	-	Considers that the EAC should not maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs based on irrelevant and unconvincing reasons, such as voting habit of the electors. Besides, the delineation exercise should not be intervened by the Government.	The EAC should adhere to all the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and the established working principles in drawing up the proposals in the delineation exercise. The EAC will not consider factors with political implications.
21	-	1	Considers that the coverage of the New Territories area is very large so the Members cannot take care of all residents in the area. Proposes that the EAC should take into account factors relating to candidates and residents in the delineation exercise so as to facilitate the LegCo Members in providing better services to residents in the districts.	The delineation proposals must be drawn up on the basis of the statutory requirements and objective data of the population distribution. The provision of services by the LegCo Members is not a relevant factor of consideration.